

Does Magnetic Charge Imply a Massive Photon ?

D. Singleton

Department of Physics, Virginia Commonwealth University, Richmond, VA 23284-2000

(February 1, 2008)

Abstract

In Abelian theories of monopoles the magnetic charge is required to be enormous. Using the electric-magnetic duality of electromagnetism it is argued that the existence of such a large, non-perturbative magnetic coupling should lead to a phase transition where magnetic charge is permanently confined and the photon becomes massive. The apparent masslessness of the photon could then be used as an argument against the existence of such a large, non-perturbative magnetic charge. Finally it is shown that even in the presence of this dynamical mass generation the Cabbibo-Ferrari [1] formulation of magnetic charge gives a consistent theory.

PACS numbers: 11.15.Ex , 11.15.Ha, 14.80.Hv

Typeset using REVTeX

I. STRONG COUPLING PHASE TRANSITION

Normally the gauge bosons of a theory are said to be massless due to the requirement of gauge invariance. If the Lagrangian of a theory has a mass term for the gauge bosons (*i.e.* a term like $\frac{1}{2}m^2 A_\mu A^\mu$) then the Lagrangian is no longer invariant under the gauge transformation of the gauge field (*i.e.* $A_\mu \rightarrow A_\mu - \frac{1}{e}\partial_\mu \Lambda(x)$, where $\Lambda(x)$ is an arbitrary function). One caveat to this prohibition is the Higgs mechanism [2] which allows the gauge boson to have a mass while still remaining consistent with gauge invariance, by coupling the gauge boson to a scalar field which develops a vacuum expectation value. A less often stated caveat is that the coupling of the gauge boson to particles of the theory needs to be small enough [3] so that the gauge boson does not become massive through some non-perturbative mechanism (*e.g.* technicolor models for mass generation in the standard model). It is difficult to give a definite value for how small the coupling constant should be in order to insure the masslessness of the gauge boson, but requiring that it be small enough so that perturbation theory is valid seems a good rule of thumb. Wilson has argued [4] that in a U(1) gauge theory there should be some critical coupling, e_c , below which the U(1) gauge boson is massless and above which it acquires a mass. Wilson's conjecture does not determine whether this phase transition from massless gauge boson to massive gauge boson is a first or second order transition, nor does it give the value of the critical coupling at which this transition should occur. This conjectured mechanism, which dynamically generates a mass for the U(1) gauge boson, is similar to an effect which was found to occur in QED in $1+1$ dimensions. Schwinger [5] rigorously showed that in $1+1$ dimensions the photon would acquire a mass proportional to e^2 , the square of the coupling. Thus in $1+1$ dimensional QED $e_c = 0$, and the photon always becomes massive. Schwinger also conjectured that the same effect could occur in $3+1$ QED for some unspecified, large coupling. Guth [6] has shown that a U(1) gauge theory will indeed undergo a phase transition as conjectured by Wilson and Schwinger, but no theoretical value for the critical coupling constant was given. Thus for $3+1$ dimensional QED it may be an "accident" of the gauge coupling, e , being small

that results in the physical photon being massless within very stringent limits (the upper bound on the photon mass is $3.0 \times 10^{-27} eV = 5.3 \times 10^{-63} kg > m_\gamma$ [7]). The amazing success of perturbation theory for the electromagnetic interactions of the electron also indicates that the physical electromagnetic coupling is below this unknown critical value. QCD in contrast is thought to exist in the confining phase with a fine structure constant, $\alpha_s = \frac{g_s^2}{4\pi}$ on the $\mathcal{O}(1)$.

In Dirac's theory of magnetic charge one allows the vector potential \mathbf{A} to develop a singularity that runs from the location of the magnetic charge to spatial infinity, so that $\nabla \cdot \mathbf{B} = \rho_m$ is consistent with the $\mathbf{B} = \nabla \times \mathbf{A}$ [8]. Dirac also showed that in order for the wavefunction of an electrically charged particle in the presence of this string singularity to be single valued, the following quantization condition had to hold

$$\frac{eg}{4\pi} = \frac{n}{2} \quad (1)$$

Where n is an integer, g is the magnitude of the magnetic charge and e is the magnitude of the electric charge (which we will take to be the charge of the electron). There are other ways of formulating a theory of magnetic charge without having to take recourse to a singular vector potential (the fiber bundle approach of Wu and Yang [9] or the two-potential approach of Cabbibo and Ferrari [1]). In all these various theories, however, one eventually ends up with a similiar quantization condition. The best model independent argument for this is due to Saha [10]. If one considers a particle with electric charge e in the presence of a particle with magnetic charge g , then due to the $\mathbf{E} \times \mathbf{B}$ term in the energy-momentum tensor this system carries a field angular momentum of magnitude $eg/4\pi$. Since angular momentum is quantized in integer multiples of $\hbar/2$ we again arrive at condition Eq. (1), where we have set $\hbar = 1$.

If e in Eq. (1) is taken as the physical charge of the electron it is found that the magnitude of the the magnetic charge is enormous. The strength of the electric coupling strength between two electric charges is $\frac{e^2}{4\pi} \approx \frac{1}{137}$, while the strength of the minimum magnetic coupling (*i.e.* $n = 1$ in Eq. (1)) between two monopoles is $\frac{g^2}{4\pi} \approx \frac{137}{4}$. The interaction

strength between two monopoles is roughly 5×10^3 times stronger than between two electric charges. The size of the magnetic coupling puts it well out of the range of perturbation theory, and opens up the logical possibility that unusual non-perturbative effects could occur in the presence of such a non-perturbative magnetic charge. In Wilson and Guth's argument for a phase transition in a U(1) gauge theory with a large coupling, the U(1) gauge charge is usually thought of as electric charge. If the U(1) gauge charge is taken to be electric charge then there is a definite difference, in the standard formulation of the theory, in the way the gauge boson couples to electric charge as compared to how it couples to magnetic charge. The electric charge is minimally coupled to the vector potential, A_μ , while the magnetic charge has no simple coupling to A_μ . Physically, however, the gauge boson should couple to both charges in a symmetric way, especially when one looks at the theory in terms of how these charges interact with the \mathbf{E} and \mathbf{B} fields. This physically intuitive idea takes the mathematical form of a dual symmetry between electric and magnetic charges, which indicates that the two types of charges are indeed interchangeable. This dual symmetry is [11]

$$\begin{aligned} J_e^\mu &\rightarrow J_e^\mu \cos\theta + J_m^\mu \sin\theta \\ J_m^\mu &\rightarrow -J_e^\mu \sin\theta + J_m^\mu \cos\theta \end{aligned} \tag{2}$$

where $J_e^\mu = (\rho_e, \mathbf{J}_e)$ and $J_m^\mu = (\rho_m, \mathbf{J}_m)$ are the electric and magnetic four current densities respectively. This dual symmetry between electric and magnetic charges and currents shows that it is a matter of convention as to what is called electric charge and what is called magnetic charge. In fact Baker *et. al.* [12] have shown that electromagnetism can be reformulated with magnetic charge as the gauge charge, which is then minimally coupled to the U(1) gauge boson, while electric charge is attached to Dirac type strings. Combining this dual symmetry with the strong coupling phase transition to a confining phase with a massive gauge boson, it can be argued that a large, non-perturbative magnetic charge would make the photon massive. The dual symmetry is important since it indicates that it should not make a difference whether the large, non-perturbative charge is electric or magnetic. Since

the photon is apparently massless to some stringent upper limit [7] this implies that Abelian magnetic charge is absent from the physical world. As we shall see the Cabbibo-Ferrari formulation of magnetic charge could still give a consistent theory even in the presence of this dynamical mass generation. Even though there is no theoretical prediction as to the critical value of the coupling at which this phase transition should occur, the value at which QCD apparently undergoes this phase transition, while not exactly determined, is certainly thought to be much less than $137/4$. Finally numerical work on compact lattice U(1) gauge theory points to a critical coupling of the order unity [13]. Assuming that as the limit of the lattice spacing is taken to zero that the lattice theory goes over smoothly into the continuum theory one again finds an indication that the required value of the magnetic coupling is in the confinement regime where the gauge boson is massive.

II. THE TECHNICOLOR ANALOGY

In this section we will give an argument, based on an analogy to the technicolor idea, that also points to the possibility that in the presence of magnetic charge the photon would develop a dynamical mass. The basic idea behind technicolor theories is to introduce a new set of fermions (*i.e.* techni- fermions) which couple to a new strong, non-Abelian gauge force called technicolor. The techni-fermions form a condensate, $\langle \bar{F}F \rangle \neq 0$, which gives the theory a vacuum expectation value. The elementary Higgs scalar is replaced by the composite scalar, $\bar{F}F$, which must have the correct quantum numbers in order to mix with the gauge boson that is to become massive. In the present case instead of the composite scalar being composed of techni-fermions it is composed of a monopole-antimonopole pair. Denoting the monopole-antimonopole condensate by Π_m we can, in analogy with technicolor introduce an effective coupling between the photon and this composite scalar particle

$$\mathcal{L}_{\gamma-m} = \frac{f_m}{2}(gA^\mu)(\partial_\mu \Pi_m) \quad (3)$$

Where f_m is a constant, which is the equivalent of the pion decay constant of QCD. This interaction term in the Lagrangian mixes the photon with the composite Π_m with a Feynman

rule vertex of $-\frac{igf_m}{2}q_\mu$, where q_μ is the momentum of the photon. Taking an infinite sum of Π_m 's mixing in with the photon changes the photon's propagator from

$$D_{\mu\nu}^\gamma = \frac{-i(g^{\mu\nu} - q_\mu q_\nu / q^2)}{q^2} \quad (4)$$

to

$$D_{\mu\nu}^\gamma = \frac{-i(g^{\mu\nu} - q_\mu q_\nu / q^2)}{q^2 - g^2 f_m^2 / 4} \quad (5)$$

The pole in the second propagator indicates that that photon now has a mass of $m_\gamma = gf_m/2$. This mass is arbitrary since the “magnetic” pion decay constant, f_m , is unspecified. Both the argument based on Wilson and Guth’s idea of a phase transition for a strongly coupled theory, and this more heuristic technicolor inspired argument point to the photon developing a mass in the presence of a large magnetic charge. Both arguments have a degree of ambiguity. In the first case the critical value at which the phase transition occurs is not determined theoretically, although QCD apparently undergoes such a phase transition at a value of the coupling which is much less than the required magnitude of magnetic coupling. In the second case the mass given to the photon is arbitrary since it depends on the unknown “magnetic” pion decay constant, f_m . In either case one could still make the argument that the mass given to the photon by the non-perturbative magnetic charge is smaller than the experimental upper limit on the photon mass. Given the stringent upper bound on the photon mass this argument is unnatural. The more likely statement is that the apparent masslessness of the photon implies the absence of magnetic charge.

III. DISCUSSION AND CONCLUSIONS

Using two different approaches we have argued that the required large, non-perturbative value of magnetic charge is inconsistent with the apparent masslessness of the photon. Or put in reverse : the apparent masslessness of the photon implies the absence of magnetic charge with the large, non-perturbative coupling which is required in monopole theories.

This statement is too broad. The Cabbibo-Ferrari formulation [1] of magnetic charge could still remain consistent with this dynamical mass generation for the photon *if* one interprets the second potential as a second gauge boson. In the Cabbibo-Ferrari approach a second pseudo four-vector potential $C_\mu = (\phi_m, \mathbf{C})$ is introduced in addition to the usual four-vector potential $A_\mu = (\phi_e, \mathbf{A})$. Then in terms of these two potentials the normal definitions of the \mathbf{E} and \mathbf{B} field get expanded to

$$E_i = F^{0i} - \mathcal{G}^{0i} \quad B_i = G^{0i} + \mathcal{F}^{0i} \quad (6)$$

where the field strength tensors are

$$F_{\mu\nu} = \partial_\mu A_\nu - \partial_\nu A_\mu \quad G_{\mu\nu} = \partial_\mu C_\nu - \partial_\nu C_\mu \quad (7)$$

and their duals

$$\mathcal{F}_{\mu\nu} = \frac{1}{2}\epsilon_{\mu\nu\rho\sigma}F^{\rho\sigma} \quad \mathcal{G}_{\mu\nu} = \frac{1}{2}\epsilon_{\mu\nu\rho\sigma}G^{\rho\sigma} \quad (8)$$

Even though there are two potentials in this approach one normally imposes conditions on these two potentials so that in the end there are only enough degrees of freedom left to account for one photon [14]. In the Cabbibo-Ferrari theory one also ends up with an enormous, non-perturbative value for the magnetic coupling due to Saha's angular momentum quantization argument. Thus, in the one photon version of the Cabbibo-Ferrari formulation, the apparent observed masslessness of the photon again implies the absence of magnetic charge. If, however, the pseudo four-vector potential is taken to be a second, parity odd photon then a consistent theory can be given even in the presence of a large, non-perturbative magnetic coupling. One can arrange for the dynamical symmetry breaking to give a mass to the pseudo photon, C_μ , while the second photon, A_μ , remains massless. This is in direct analogy with what happens in the $SU_L(2) \times U(1)$ standard model, where the Z boson becomes massive while the photon remains massless. This happens whether the symmetry breaking is spontaneous or dynamical. Thus taking, C_μ , as a real gauge boson not only allows one to have a non-perturbative magnetic coupling, but also naturally explains the absence of this

second pseudo photon from the particle spectrum that has so far been probed. Most work on the Cabbibo-Ferrari theory of magnetic charge takes the view of Ref. [14] that there is only one photon. However there are a few works which do regard the potential, C_μ , as being a second, physical photon [15].

Wilson and Guth have argued that in a U(1) gauge theory there should be a critical value of the coupling such that the theory undergoes a phase transition to a confining theory where the U(1) gauge boson becomes massive. Combining this idea with the required large, non-perturbative magnetic charge which occurs in all monopole theories, and the electric-magnetic duality (which implies that it should not matter whether the non-perturbative coupling is electric or magnetic) we contend that the photon acquires a dynamical mass in the presence of magnetic charge. From an experimental point of view one can point to the SU(3) theory of the strong interaction, which is thought to exist in the confining phase with a coupling constant that is considerably less than the coupling constant a magnetic monopole is required to have. The apparent experimental masslessness of the photon then implies the absence of Abelian magnetic monopoles of the Dirac or Wu-Yang type. A consistent monopole theory is still possible if one works with the Cabbibo-Ferrari theory *and* takes the somewhat unorthodox view that the second pseudo four-vector potential corresponds to a physical gauge boson.

The arguments given here should be taken strictly as applying only to Abelian monopoles. Objects like the 't Hooft-Polyakov monopole [16], while also having an enormous magnetic charge, are of a somewhat different character than the Dirac or Wu-Yang monopoles. These magnetically charged objects come from an embedding of a U(1) symmetry within a larger non-Abelian gauge group. Additionally the magnetic charge of the theory is connected with the unusual topological structure of the Higgs field. Both of these facts make it difficult to formulate an electric-magnetic dual symmetry for the 't Hooft-Polyakov theory. Since this dual symmetry was crucial to our argument we can not use the arguments presented here to place any restrictions on the existence of 't Hooft-Polyakov magnetic charges.

IV. ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

The author wishes to thank Siegfried Roscher and Leonard O' Neill for help and encouragement during the completion of this work. Additionally the author acknowledges useful conversations with Atsushi Yoshida and Mike Timmins.

REFERENCES

- [1] N. Cabibbo and E. Ferrari, Nuovo Cimento **23**, 1147 (1962)
- [2] P.W. Higgs, Phys. Lett. **12**, 132 (1964); Phys. Rev. Lett. **13**, 508 (1964); Phys. Rev. **145**, 1156 (1966)
- [3] Kerson Huang, *Quarks, Leptons and Gauge Fields*, (World Scientific Publishing Co., 1982) p.50
- [4] K. Wilson, Phys. Rev. **D10**, 2445 (1974)
- [5] J. Schwinger, Phys. Rev. **125**, 397 (1962); Phys. Rev. **128**, 2425 (1962)
- [6] A. Guth, Phys. Rev. **D21**, 2291 (1980)
- [7] Particle Data Group, Phys. Rev. **D50**, 1351 (1994)
- [8] P.A.M. Dirac, Proc. Roy. Soc. **A 133**, 60 (1931); Phys. Rev. **74**, 817 (1948)
- [9] T.T. Wu and C.N. Yang, Phys. Rev. **D12**, 3845 (1975)
- [10] M.N. Saha, Ind. J. Phys. **10**, 145 (1936); Phys. Rev. **75** 1968 (1949); H.A. Wilson, Phys. Rev. **75**, 309 (1949)
- [11] J.D. Jackson, *Classical Electrodynamics 2nd* Edition, (John Wiley & Sons, 1975) p. 251
- [12] M. Baker, J.S. Ball, and F. Zachariasen, Phys. Rev. **D51** 1968 (1995)
- [13] T.A. DeGrand and D. Toussaint, Phys. Rev. **D22**, 2478 (1980); B. Lautrup and M. Nauenberg, Phys. Lett. **B95**, 63 (1980)
- [14] D. Zwanziger, Phys. Rev. **D3**, 880 (1971)
- [15] C.R. Hagen, Phys. Rev. **140**, B804 (1965); A. Salam, Phys. Lett. **22**, 683 (1966); J.G. Taylor, Phys. Rev. Lett. **18**, 713 (1967)
- [16] G. 't Hooft, Nucl. Phys. bf B79, 276 (1974); A.M. Poyakov, JETP Lett. **20**, 194 (1974)